

Response to Restriction  
Requirement Dated July 9, 2003

Appln. No. 09/998,878

- 2 -

August 7, 2003

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action dated July 9, 2003. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Election in Response to Restriction Requirement

Applicant hereby elects, with traverse, Species II illustrated by Figure 2 as defined by the Examiner. Applicant identifies pending Claims 1-21 as readable on Figure 2.

Traversal

Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction and notes that, according to the MPEP, Section 803, there are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction:

- (1) the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and
- (2) there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required.

Applicant submits that there would not be a serious burden on the Examiner if all of the Species I, II and III were searched and examined in the same application due to the natural relationship between the articles. Efficiencies related to searching may even be realized if all Species I, II

Response to Restriction  
Requirement Dated July 9, 2003

Appln. No. 09/998,878

- 3 -

August 7, 2003

and III are examined together. Applicant, therefore, requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn and all Claims 1-30 be examined.

Respectfully submitted,

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP

By: John A. Chionchio  
John A. Chionchio  
Reg. No. 40,954

1101 Market Street, Suite 2600  
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950  
Telephone: (215) 923-4466  
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189

JAC/dml

M:\DLarsen\SecantMedical\24463Ausa\24463ARESTRICTION.REQUIREMENT